

THE COVENANTERS AFTER THE REVOLUTION OF 1688

BY REV. W. McMILLAN, D.D., PH.D.

WITH the coming of William, Prince of Orange, to these Islands the persecution of the Covenanters in Scotland ceased. It had been slackening for some time before, though as late as June of that year, a man George Wood, in Ayrshire, was shot in the fields on suspicion of being a "Whig". The great majority of those who had been favourable to covenanting ways returned to the National Church, especially in those parishes where the Curates had either been driven away or gone off on their own. In my native parish, Sanquhar, two of the Covenanters mentioned in Simpson's *Traditions* are found not long after the Revolution, as Elders in the Parish Church.

The "Society men," as those Covenanters who were banded together in small groups were called, and who were the extremists of the movement, still remained in isolation ; but it has to be remembered that they formed only a section of the party. Alexander Peden, to take one example, never belonged to the Societies, and there is some reason to believe that John Brown of Priesthill was actually expelled from their membership.

The first General Meeting of this party after the Revolution was held at Douglas on 3rd January, 1689. There are said to have been three hundred armed men present, as well as "several of the inhabitants of the town." At this meeting it was resolved to improve the military organisation of the Societies. The captains and lieutenants of companies were to take into consideration the proposals made, and to endeavour to get the same put into practice. I am of the opinion that it is to this period that the majority if not all the covenanting flags belong. Every body who has possessed such a thing during the last century has been quite convinced that it was flown both at Drumclog and at Bothwell Bridge. The gathering at the former was for worship and it has never been customary to carry flags to Divine Service. Again the number of flags alleged to have been there should cause one to pause and think. At the Glasgow Exhibition of 1938 there were exhibited in the Covenanting Section no less than four flags which were all alleged to have been at Drumclog. The authenticity of these was challenged in the correspondence columns of the *Glasgow Herald* and the Convener of the Section, the Rev. James Barr, in reply, not only asserted that they were genuine relics of that skirmish,

The Battle of Bothwell Bridge is of course another matter. There is no doubt that both parties carried flags at it, though Wyck's picture shows only six on the Covenanters' side and about three times that number on the other. But nearly twelve hundred Covenanters were taken prisoners on that day, and we must conclude that few banners would survive the battle. Indeed the banners could only have been carried at a period when there was little or no opposition to their use, and it is an interesting fact that all the Covenanting flags which are dated bear a date after the Revolution. I know of two, the one of which bears the date 1689, and the other which is undated is almost identical except that it bears no date. There is no doubt in my own mind that both were made by the same person. The one flag was associated with Douglas and the other with Sanquhar. Another is preserved at Earlston in Galloway. It bears the date 1715, but is alleged, like so many more, to have been at Drumclog and Bothwell. The date, it is said, must have been added later!

PHINICK FOR GOD COUNTRY
AND COVENANTED WORK OF REFORMATION.

The blank in the first line suggests that it was made at a time when there was uncertainty as to who was the ruler of the land for it is almost certain that the missing word is KING. As we know there was much debate among the post-Revolution Covenanters as to whether they would recognise William of Orange as King seeing that he had not taken the Covenant and had apparently no intention of so doing. It will be noticed also that the flag purports to be a parish or district flag, and one would think must have been carried by a contingent from the place mentioned on it. But there is no evidence that organised bands came from any parish or district to either Drumclog or Bothwell Bridge. The United Societies were not in existence at that period. After 1688 it was different. The Covenanters were by then organised in their Societies which were again united in larger groups called "Correspondences." So it comes that among the Covenanting flags there are quite a number like that of "Phinigk," definitely associated with separate districts, e.g., "For the Barrony of Sanquhair," "For the Barrony of Crawford." "For the Parish of Shotts." "For Lesmahagow," "Cumnock." From Avondale there are two, both alleged to have been at Drumclog, "Avendaill for Reformation," and "Avendail for Religion Covenant King." The latter, it may be conjectured, was carried by a more moderate group than the former, seeing they were prepared to recognise the King. Both are in my view post Revolution. The other flag which I wish to mention is also one which according to some writers was at the two battles, but in this case it is the enemies of the Covenant who are keen to make out that it is a genuine relic of pre-Revolution days. I refer to the "Bluidy Banner." This is blue in colours and bears the following inscription :

JEHOVAH NISSI (In Hebrew characters.)

FOR CHRIST AND HIS TRUTHS (In gold letters.)

NO QUARTER FOR YE ACTIVE ENEMIES OF YE COVENANT (In red letters.)

There is no doubt in my mind that this is a genuine relic of covenanting days, but like the other banners I have mentioned, it belongs to post-Revolution times. Dr. Fleming points out that there is a reference to it in a pamphlet issued by the United Societies in 1724. It then belonged to an insignificant sect, which comprised about half a dozen men and a few women, one Peter Grant being the leader. From the pamphlet it appears that the flag was made for the sect and consequently dates from a period about forty years after Bothwell Brig. One of the anti-covenanting writers in his fear lest this damaging evidence regarding the blood thirsty dispositions of the Covenanters should be lost, actually suggests that it may have been copied from a genuine relic of that battle,

a suggestion for which it need not be said there is not the slightest evidence. There is nothing but a nineteenth century tradition, which was first heard in 1859 to connect it with the actual covenanting combats.

Before we leave this period of military activity on the part of the Covenanters we may point out that, at a General Meeting held in Sanquhar, it was agreed that men skilled in the use of arms should be engaged to drill the members and be paid for their services. Officers were to be appointed by the various Societies and these officers were to appoint representatives to the General Meeting. A little later at Crawfordjohn (13th Feb., 1689) a number of armed men were sent to Edinburgh from the Societies in order to protect the Convention of Estates then sitting from the attacks which it was feared Claverhouse and his Jacobite friends might make. There is no doubt that this action of the "Wild Westland Whigs," as they were called did something to keep the peace and to allow the Revolution Settlement to be carried through without any violent opposition.

(We pass over the troubles regarding the raising of the Cameronian Regiment, an account of which will be found in the Regimental History by Andrew Ross.)

Another General Meeting of the Societies was held at Douglas on 3rd December, 1690, when the three ministers appeared, and they informed the members that they had joined the National Church at the General Assembly held in November, and advised the rest to do the same. They said that while they "would not impose on any person, yet they advised them to hear those ministers who were most free and faithful." The suggestion was made that a paper might be prepared which could be given by any member to the Minister of a congregation he wished to join, or to the Presbytery of the bounds. This was to indicate that their uniting with others was not to be considered as a "condemning of, or receding from, our former testimony." Some were for preparing such a paper, others were against it. It appears that the former were in the majority, for such a paper was prepared and issued to any who might desire it. After this the debates were brought to a close. Another meeting was fixed for the first Wednesday in April, 1691, and the members separated. When they (or some of them) next met in conference it was as another body.

The first step towards what might be called the re-organisation of the Societies appears to have been taken by Robert Hamilton, who had been on the Continent from 1679 to 1688, and who had constituted himself the leader in opposition to the movements proposed by the "ministers and majority of the people" during the two years after the Revolution. All who did not approve his views were guilty of "gross defections."

Some time in 1691 there was drawn up by the Society, at Tinwald in Nithsdale, a paper in which the errors of the time, as seen by the members, were faithfully dealt with. This paper was sent to some of the Societies which still functioned, and the response was such that they determined to proceed with their efforts for re-organisation. John Howie in the Appendix to *Faithful Contendings* gives what he calls a brief extract of this paper and as this abstract runs to fully 7,000 words we can only conjecture what the full length was. Even from what is preserved, we can see that this document was as thorough-going a paper as was ever issued by the "remnant." Not only were all condemned who had heard the Curates or in any way helped the "Indulged," but a ban was put on all who had listened to Shields, Lining, and Boyd, since they had gone back to the Church of Scotland.

But their troubles were by no means over, for when the first General Meeting was held after the issue of this paper, it was found that there were tares among the wheat. "When gathered and searching into one another's judgement as to the state of the testimony," says the writer of the *Informatory Vindication*, "We found ourselves to be but a mix'd company," and consequently, before anything was done, they had to "purge their meetings from all such as had sinfully joined with the courses of the times and were defending the same." Where this General Meeting was held, we do not know, but probably it was at or in the vicinity of Tinwald, from which place the paper had been issued. How many were removed at the "purging" is also unknown, but they must have formed a considerable proportion of the body. The scribe goes on to say, "having got our meeting purged of such as had made defection to the contrary party (probably those who adhered to Shields, Lining, and Boyd), we emitted a Declaration, August 10th, 1692, which speaks for itself." This was the first of the post-Revolution Declarations promulgated at the Cross of Sanquhar, where three others had been made in pre-Revolution days. Others were issued at the same place in 1695, 1703 and 1707.

The Societies seem to have done very little without causing controversy in their own ranks. After the Sanquhar Declaration of 1695, we learn that in consequence of it the "Correspondences of Eskdale and Forrest" seceded. We do not know what part of the Declaration was displeasing to them, but for about twelve years they remained apart from the main body. The schism appears to have been partly closed about 1707 for in that year, May 26th, the General Meeting agreed to confer with their friends in "the Correspondences of Eskdale and Forrest . . . in order to remove differences . . . in carrying on of the testimony." It was not however until December, 1709, that McMillan, who became the Pastor

of the Societies in 1706, visited these Correspondences for the purpose of administering Baptism, and on the 5th and 6th of that month he baptised 27 in Eskdale and on the 8th he baptised 4 in "Forrest."

This was not the only split among the Societies. In his Introduction to the volume, *Six Saints of the Covenant*, which deals with the works of Patrick Walker, Dr. Hay Fleming states that in Hutchison's work, *The Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland*, one may "look in vain even for the names of the small sections whom Patrick calls, Adamites, Harlites, Howdenites, and Russelites, or for the 'Cotmoor folk.'" These were all small parties who had broken away from the Societies for some reason or another. In his "Life of Alexander Peden," written *circa* 1725, Patrick tells us that at that time the Presbyterians of Scotland were then divided into ten parties. Some of these can be easily identified. In addition to those four sects mentioned above (the Harlites and the Cotmoor folk were the same), we have the Church of Scotland, the Hebronites, the McMillanites (as the Societies were named after 1706). The other three were probably those who followed Peter Grant, those who followed William Wilson, and it is possible that the third party was one which had been formed in Nithsdale by some Ministers, who thought the National Church was not sufficiently faithful to covenanting ways. These Ministers, however, never considered themselves as having separated from the Church of Scotland. The Glassites did not come into existence until a little later.

Taking the Russelites first, they were the followers of James Russel who was implicated in the murder of the Archbishop of St. Andrews. This was the only party (except the Gibbites) which was pre-Revolution in origin. The Gibbites seem to have faded away before that event.

Russel left a manuscript account of the killing of the Archbishop and of his own adventures thereafter. This lay among the Wodrow papers for many years and was published in 1817 under the editorship of Charles Kirkpatrick Sharpe who was, it may be said, quite unqualified for the task. The special tenet of the Russelites was their refusal to pay any taxes or tolls whatsoever. The Covenanters generally refused to pay the cess levied for the upkeep of the dragoons who were preying on the people of the land, but the Russelites went far beyond that. As early as 15th June, 1682, Russel was at a General Meeting of the Societies held at Tala Linn in Tweedsmuir and there caused trouble among the brethren by his demands that they should follow his example. He is described by the scribe as a "man of a hot and fiery spirit," and he demanded to know, "If they (the members of the Societies) were free of paying customs at Ports or Bridges." He knew well enough that they were not; but he

and "some few with him" made it a cause of separation from what Michael Shields calls, the "witnessing party," because of this. Generally speaking the Covenanters made no bones about paying custom on the goods they took to market, or the charges which were made for the use of bridges, etc. But by the Russelites that was accounted to them for unfaithfulness in the cause, and they refused to have any fellowship with those who paid such dues. As both ale and tobacco were taxed the Russelites had to abstain from both, which Patrick Walker called "a fool thing." The Russelites seem to have kept up their separateness after the Revolution, when their greater strictness would doubtless win them some adherents. There is evidence that some of the party objected to the names of the days of the week and months of the years, contending that "those who own such names serve themselves heirs to that same (if not greater) punishment, which God inflicted upon idolators of old." Russel when he fled the country went to Groningen in Holland and seems to have spent the rest of his life there. Kirkpatrick Sharpe makes the somewhat strange statement that there Russel met John Flint, a protege of the United Societies who was studying for the Ministry, and that the latter was persuaded by him to cut his connection with the Societies. Flint certainly did cut that connection or was repudiated by them, and on his return to Scotland was ordained in Burghlee Meeting House (in Lasswade). After being Minister of Lasswade from 1688 to 1710, he became Minister of the New North Church, Edinburgh, in 1710, and died there in 1730. If Russel had anything to do with Flint's change of views, one would be inclined to think that the latter would be disgusted with what he saw in Russel.

We turn now to the Adamites and here there is some difficulty in deciding what was the party which Patrick called by that name. Dr. Hay Fleming thinks that they were the followers of William Adams, a graduate of Edinburgh University, who, after being Schoolmaster at Prestonpans, was ordained at Humbie in 1701. He refused to subscribe the Formula, stating that there was no need to repeat what he had already done. He was rebuked by the Synod, and the Presbytery was charged "to keep a watchful eye over him." He demitted his charge in 1714, and commenced business as a printer in Edinburgh. He may have formed some sort of sect as in those days there would be no difficulty in finding followers. Personally, however, I am inclined to think that the Adamites were followers of John Adamson, who was licensed by the Presbytery of Perth about the beginning of the 18th century, which, for some reason would not give him an extract of his licence. He came to the West of Scotland and there preached against the Union, the Abjuration Oath, Toleration, etc., becoming quite popular. He was not looked upon with any great

favour by either Hepburn or McMillan, perhaps by reason of that popularity. Wodrow says that Hepburn would not own Adamson because the latter "had no testimonials or licence." Knowing the light in which he regarded Church censures and sentences, we cannot think that lack of papers would make much difference in Hepburn's opinions. Afterwards two Perth Ministers gave a testimonial to Adamson, which led Wodrow to wonder "how far this will go with the Hebronites."

From Patrick Walker, we learn that Adamson's conduct in the parish of Sorn did not approve itself to the more strict, for though he had "the conveniency of that chamber where Mr. Peden had the troubled night," yet he had not taken one moment's time for prayer, reading, or meditation. Adamson, though only a Probationer, took it upon himself to baptise and marry. Not only so, he eventually carried through his own marriage ceremony. He read the banns at one of his meetings and drew up, says Patrick, "a form of marriage oath and caused a man under a *mala fide* to read it before them. This was all the marriage he had." This marriage took place in Carnock and the Synod of Fife ordered a paper to be read in all the Churches of the bounds concerning the scandal. After the precentor had read this paper in Carnock, the Minister, James Hog, supplemented it. One of the elders then rose and contradicted the Minister, and in this was backed up by two members of the congregation. The Societies in 1713, issued a warning against Adamson thinking him, "a greater snare to the people of God than others," because of his professed "zeal against the corruptions of the times." The General Assembly of 1715, referred Adamson to the Commission by which he was excommunicated. But, says Patrick, "he gave them groats for pease, he excommunicated them." He issued at least one pamphlet justifying his separation from the National Church. His is the party which I think Patrick Walker had in view, when he referred to the Adamites. He tells that Adamson formed a party of his own but says nothing of Adams doing so.

We come now to another sect mentioned by Walker and which was the perhaps best known of all the sub-sections of the "Remnant." This was the Harlites, or "Cote Moor Folk," as they were sometimes called. Their leaders were two brothers, John and Andrew Harley, and they must have formed one of earlier companies who withdrew from the fellowship of the Societies. As early as 1697 Widow Cleghorn, whose maiden name was Isobel Wright, leaves her testimony against those "who were commonly called the Cotemuir folk." She says of them, "I never saw any in my time that professed godliness have such a practice as they . . . And they stand not to say and constantly to maintain, that the testimony of Jesus is in their hands and in the hands of no other but them and those that adhere to them." Wodrow writes of them that they were the writers

of some virulent papers and that they pretended to great revelations. He goes on, "They are dreadful cheats, they pretend to fastings and yet eat in secret. Ninian Oliphant was proselyted by them for a week and made to fast three days, and at length discovered them eating in secret and left them." Probably this Ninian Oliphant was the person who is mentioned in the minutes of the General Correspondence of the Societies as being one of those sent to Edinburgh in 1689, and also as having married irregularly in his own house, in the presence of a number of the members. A proceeding which led to some trouble. Patrick Walker seems to have had some dealings with the Harleys and there was no love lost between them. He tells us that the two brothers, John and Andrew Harley, had "usurped the office of the ministry taking upon them at their own hand, not being orderly called, to preach, marry, and baptise, which all sound Presbyterians abhor however (otherwise) qualified they may be." Despite his views on their irregularities, Patrick attended a service when Andrew preached in the Cowgate of Edinburgh. His hearers consisted of John Harley, five women, a boy, and a girl. The Chronicler's opinion of the sermon was a poor one. "He (Harley) rambled through the whole 58th Chapter of Isaiah, but his sermon had neither top, tail, nor mane; he had not one material sentence." Harley did not allow Patrick's words to pass without protest and in a pamphlet declared, "He (Walker) is a most impudent person to pretend to know what passed that day; for the most of the whole time he had a most unseemly and indecent carriage by sotting and sleeping like one intoxicate with drink, till those that came with him were ashamed of him, and the report going of him of his being drunk at times gives the more ground to suspect." No wonder that Walker spoke of Harley's attack, as "that malicious wicked pamphlet stuf with gross lies, that he has signed and published against me, in the name of the rest of that enthusiastic Quakerish party." The Harlites were a small body but they appear to have been pretty widely known. Allan Ramsay in giving what he calls a "short swatch" of his Creed to Arbuckle says:—

"Nor can believe ant's nae great ferly,
In Cotmoor fouk and Andrew Harley."

We turn now to the "Howdenites," who if a somewhat small body were perhaps the most aggressive of the post-Revolution fragments of the Cameronians. There is an interesting reference to the founder and leader of the party in the reminiscences of John Ramsay of Ochertyre, which were published under the title, *Scotland and Scotsmen in the Eighteenth Century*. "John Howden, the famous fanatic, was the first excellent tradesman in that way (upholstery) in Scotland. . . . When the young ladies teased John at his work he called them in his great wrath 'the

children of Ashdod.' He would have extirpated with fire and sword all that were not of his opinion, who by the most liberal computation never exceeded a hundred. Withal he was a Jacobite, styling George II 'the occupant'." While Ramsay says that Howden was a Jacobite, we will see later that he had no more use for the House of Stewart than he had for the House of Hanover. The Howdenites' first paper, so far as I can find out, was one which was published in Edinburgh on 28th October, 1712. No copy is known to exist and we know of it only by a reference in a later paper. The occasion of it was the passing of the Act of Parliament authorising the Abjuration Oath. Not content with denouncing the Act and oath alike, the party burned them publicly at the Cross of Edinburgh and then marched up the High Street, with the burning papers on the point of a dagger, proclaiming with a loud voice, "Let King Jesus reign and all His enemies be scattered: No abjuration oath, no oath but the Covenant's, down with Popery, Prelacy, and Erastianism, and up with true Presbytery and the Covenants." This account was published in 1749, and to it are attached the initials, J. H.

In my view it was the Howdenites who made the Declaration at the Cross of Edinburgh on the day (5th Aug.) on which George I was proclaimed King. Queen Anne died on the 1st August, but news did not reach Edinburgh until the 4th. The official letter was received by the Earl of Islay, then Lord Justice General, probably the leading man in Scotland at the time. Islay made much of the occasion, for it is on record that the company which gathered round the Cross of Edinburgh that day was the "most brilliant assemblage which the city had ever seen." One does not know what actually happened, but it seems that when the state officials with their gorgeous retinue had left to go to the pier of Leith, there to proclaim the monarch for the benefit (supposed) of the Scots living furth of Scotland, the little band of enthusiasts made their proclamation at the Cross. We can picture them, a small group of serious looking men gathered at a "close-moath" watching till the great procession had moved on and then stepping forward and affixing their declaration to the pillar. In 1749 the Howdenites issued a pamphlet entitled *The Active Testimony of the true Presbyterians of Scotland*, and this contains no less than seven documents which we may call Declarations which were issued from time to time by this party. By this date, John Halden or Howden had formed his followers into what was called, "the most Serene and most Potent in the Lord, the Covenanted States of the Commonwealth of Scotland adhering to the annexed testimony." In this they claimed to act in the "Name of the Lord Jesus Christ the sole and only King of the whole earth and supreme head of our State, and in our own name and authority as his Vicegerents." In this document dated

“ 29th day of October, 1739, being the first year of our Covenanted States,” at Laudinum the party declare war on “ the Turk, Pope, and Prelates, and all their associates and abettors whatever, without any league or truce whatever.” What probably was the last of their papers was one which appears to have been issued by them on the occasion of the General Assembly’s appointment of a national thanksgiving, “ for our surprising deliverance from the late wicked and unnatural rebellion, to be observed on the fourth Thursday of June.” On the 26th June, 1746, this national thanksgiving was observed in the most of the Parish Churches throughout the land. The Seceders had been on the Hanoverian side during the struggle while the Cameronians had observed a neutral position. But the Howdenites let it be known that they were against both parties and it is worthy of note that the language used about the Duke of Cumberland is much more virulent than that used about Prince Charles. The Declaration is directed against “ the late Invasion of Scotland by the two young Pretenders, viz., Charles and William.” Charles is condemned for coming here at all and for such things as demanding that the inhabitants should bring in their horses and carriages to assist him, as well as for asking “ taxes and cess.” The conduct of his army showed that they “ are very bad Protestants.” But the Howdenites had worse things to say ; Also we reckon it is a great vice in Charles, his foolish pity and lenity in sparing these profane blasphemous Red-coats that Providence put into his hands, when by putting them to death this poor land might have been eased of the heavy Burden of these vermin of Hell.” They point out that if Charles had done as they wanted, then, “ he would have had fewer to have foughten against him and guarded his people to the Gallows,” a statement of fact which nobody could deny. As for his cousin King George he is even more vigorously condemned. “ The Occupant upon the throne, to secure himself in his usurpation,” had joined with two of “ the most Idolatrous and Bloody limbs of Anti-Christ . . . the cursed Jezebel of Austria and the little fierce tyger of Savoy.” He had authorised his son, the pretended Duke of Cumberland, “ to invade Scotland with a hellish crew of Red-coats who came in as vermin in shoals from Flanders and England, as if the flood gates of hell had been opened, bellowing forth their curses and blasphemous oaths and robbing, stealing, and ruining all wherever they came, sheltering all their villainies with this nick-name ‘ Ye are rebels,’ though never so innocent : When it is notour to all that they are the greatest Rebels against God and the laws of the land and even Humanity itself that ever the Sun saw.” The military broke the Sabbath by “ idleness, gaming, and other debaucheries ” ; while the Duke himself “ disdained to be present at any sort of worship all the time he was in Scotland, but wrought all manner of wickedness with greediness and with a high

hand." Among the Howdenites' complaints there is this regarding "the horrid cruelty, barbarity, and inhumanity committed after the Battle of Culloden upon the wounded and innocent, by these monsters of men . . . and their more than brutal leaders, who in cold blood most barbarously murdered the wounded." They also, like "arrant cowards," killed a number of innocent bystanders in cold blood. Then like "incarnate devils" they raged through the country, murdering Women and Children and old infirm men in many places." No wonder that Cumberland earned the title of "Butcher," for his forces practiced a "barbarity, scarcely to be found among the Turks and Tartars; but only in the Spanish Inquisition from whom they seem to have copied and imitated all their cruelties."

We turn now to what was perhaps the largest of the parties which seceded from the McMillanites. When McMillan joined the United Societies there is no doubt he received a welcome from many of the members, but there were others, who wondered whether a Minister such as he, was a fit person to minister to Cameronians. He had been deposed but still considered himself a Minister of the National Church, to the extent of keeping possession of the manse, using the Church, and meeting in consultation with its Elders. Things however went more or less smoothly until after the accession of George I. The question of issuing a Declaration against him was mooted by the members, but evidently McMillan and others persuaded the General Meeting instead of doing so to send to His Majesty an address which would set out their case against the Government. This was done and what was termed a "Representation of Grievances," was prepared and sent to the King (or rather to The High and Mighty Prince George Lewis Augustus, Elector of Brunswick . . . now proclaimed King of Britain and Ireland." One might have expected that this would have satisfied the stalwarts, but not so. A large party withdrew under the leadership of William Wilson a teacher in Douglas and this party was large enough to have District Correspondences and a General Meeting of its own. Hutchison in the *Reformed Presbyterian Church in Scotland* says that Wilson was the life-long enemy of McMillan, and in "The Martyr Graves of Scotland" it is said that this was because the teacher had been rebuked by the minister for drunkenness. This party seems to have been responsible for a Declaration issued in April, 1715, "Against the Proclamation, Accession, and Establishment of George, Duke of Hanover, to be King in these lands and all his abettors and supporters." Those who issued it speak of themselves as "being few, small and despised, as sheep without a shepherd, having no help of man at all, none to take care of our souls," which shows that they had then broken with McMillan. This Declaration is a large one and runs to 28 closely printed quarto pages, and is most thorough in denouncing all who do not agree with its tenets.

This party was responsible for another Declaration, mentioned in "Dying Testimonies" on 20th July, 1727, made at the Cross of Sanquhar. The occasion was the accession of George II, and though the document has vanished, there need be little doubt that the Wilsonites, if we may call them such, had no more use for the son than they had for the father. Some six years later the party emitted another Declaration, this time at Lanark, and in 1740, one at Linlithgow. This Linlithgow paper is referred to as having been written in "a vain and uncharitable strain," in a document published by the main body (the *Mount Herrick* paper) in 1741. Wilson's party published another Declaration at Rutherglen in 1742, and we learn from Wilson himself that he was the principal author of the same. This had reference to "that emissary of Satan, George Whitfield, and that delusion of Satan at Cambuslang." Another Declaration of the Wilsonites was published at the Cross of Sanquhar in 17th July, 1746. The occasion of this one was the day of thanksgiving, appointed by the General Assembly for deliverance from the rebels. The Wilsonites like the Howdenites were as much opposed to the invasion by Cumberland as to that of Charles. Wilson died in 1757 and his party gradually died out. One of the last survivors was John Calderwood, who published *Dying Testimonies* in 1806, a book which throws some light on the post-Revolution views of the "Remnant." John died unmarried because he held that only a lawful Minister of the Gospel could perform the ceremony and that there was not such a Minister to be found on the earth. It may be noted that he held the view that the National Church, the Burghers, and the Relief, were much to be preferred to the Anti-Burghers and the Reformed Presbyterians, for while the former did not profess to abide by the Covenants, the latter did so, but were not faithful to their profession.

